DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 554 EC 006 090

AUTHOR	Anderson, Robert M., Comp. and Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the First Conference on Professional Laboratory Experiences in Special Education (Normal, Illinois, May 9-10, 1969).
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Univ., Normal. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.
PUB DATE	Nov 69
NOTE	93p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.75
DESCRIPTORS	Aurally Handicapped, *Conferences, Emotionally Disturbed, *Exceptional Child Education, *Handicapped Children, Learning Disabilities, Mentally Handicapped, Physically Handicapped, Socially Maladjusted, Speech Handicapped, *Student Teaching, Supervision, *Teacher Education, Visually Handicapped
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois State University

ABSTRACT

The proceedings include explanations of the conference's purpose in the student teaching program at Illinois State University. George Richmond considers the goals and objectives of that program and Cecilia Lauby discusses philosophy, theory, and principles of supervision. Group discussions are reported regarding mentally, physically, visually, and aurally handicapped children as well as those with speech problems, social and emotional maladjustment, and learning disabilities. A student panel on student teaching is summarized and an evaluation of the conference is provided. (JD)

PRINTED BY THE STANDARD REGISTER COMPANY, U. S. A.
FORM 0801

ED0 40554

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST CONFERENCE ON PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

ROBERT M. ANDERSON, Ed.D.
DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

The Conference reported herein was supported through TITLE VI, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois

November, 1969

EC006090 E

ED040554

Proceedings of the

First Conference on Professional Laboratory Experiences in Special Education

Compiled and Edited by

Robert M. Anderson, Ed.D.
Coordinator of Professional Laboratory Experiences
in Special Education

With a Foreword by

Harold R. Phelps, Ph.D.
Chairman

Department of Special Education
School of Education
Illinois State University

1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Conference Reported Herein was Supported by a Grant from TITLE VI, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois. Acknowledgment of the assistance and interest of Dr. Cecilia Lauby and Mr. George Richmond, Department of Professional Laboratory Experiences, is gratefully made.

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD
Dr. Harold R. Phelps i

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

INTRODUCTION
Dr. Robert M. Anderson 1

PHILOSOPHY, THEORY, AND PRINCIPLES OF SUPERVISION
Dr. Cecilia J. Lauby 5

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM
Dr. George S. Richmond 12

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE SPEECH HANDICAPPED
Miss Doris M. Richards 20

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED
Dr. Geraldine K. Fergen 33

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED
Miss Evelyn J. Rex 38

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING
Miss Vivian R. Tasker 42

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL MALADJUSTMENT AND LEARNING DISABILITIES
Mr. Kenneth R. Beckman 52

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE MENTALLY RETARDED
Miss Judith J. Smithson 57

STUDENT PANEL: "MYTHS OR REALITIES"
Miss Judith J. Smithson 63

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF THE CONFERENCE
Dr. Robert M. Anderson 68

APPENDIXES
A. Conference Program 76

B. Conference Participants 79

C. Evaluation Forms for Student Teaching 84

FOREWORD

Student teaching is the capstone experience in the making of a teacher. It is here that the efforts of the University and the various educational programs in communities and institutions come to focus in achieving the metamorphosis from student in training to professional teacher. Essential to this process is good communication among the student, cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. To bring about positive changes in the student teaching process candid, frank evaluation involving the student, cooperating teacher and university supervisor working as colleagues must be communicated. This monograph reports the results of an institute designed to facilitate and make visible the evaluation of the student teaching process in special education at Illinois State University.

Faculty members of the Departments of Professional Laboratory Experiences and Special Education have always highly valued and sought suggestions from students and cooperating teachers for the improvement of student teaching. Various methods have been used quite successfully in the past to elicit suggestions. The departments are pleased that this more intensive approach was made possible by a grant from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, funded under Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10).

The contents of this report demonstrate that this has been a fruitful project. Only the central theme of each speaker, panel, or discussion group has been reported, inasmuch as the total amount of material covered during the conference would have been too voluminous to be included in its entirety. It would be desirable for similar institutes to be carried out every two or three years to assist us in improving our student teaching program. It is our hope that this monograph will provide concrete help to participants in the institute and others responsible for various aspects of the student teaching process.

Harold R. Phelps, Chairman
Department of Special Education
Illinois State University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the members of the Department of Professional Laboratory Experiences who served as keynote speakers, many persons contributed to the success of the First Conference on Professional Laboratory Experiences in Special Education.

The cooperation and contributions of Dr. Harold Phelps, Chairman of the Department of Special Education, Illinois State University, are deeply appreciated.

Very special thanks are due to Dr. Dean S. Hage, Professor of Special Education, Illinois State University, who presided over the conference.

Appreciation is also extended to the following members of the Department of Special Education, Illinois State University, who provided leadership for the group discussions in the various areas of exceptionality and who served on the Conference Planning Committee.

Mr. Kenneth R. Beckman, Assistant Professor of Special Education

Dr. Geraldine K. Fergen, Professor of Special Education

Miss Evelyn J. Rex, Assistant Professor of Special Education

Miss Doris M. Richards, Assistant Professor of Speech Pathology

Dr. George S. Richmond, Instructor and College Supervisor of Off-Campus Student Teaching

Miss Judith J. Smithson, Instructor in Special Education

Miss Vivian R. Tasker, Assistant Professor of Special Education

We are, indeed, indebted to the many administrators and teachers who participated in the conference and the University's students who served as panel members and recorders at the panel session and group discussions.

Thanks are also due to Mrs. Linda Hough, Mrs. Fran Dotson, Mrs. Virginia Guttschow, Miss Nancy Razor, Miss Kathy Quiram, Miss Mary Elston, and Mr. Donald Farrimond, who assisted the Project Director with the many aspects of the planning and administration of the conference and the preparation of this report.

It is with gratitude that we acknowledge the interest and assistance of Mrs. Lenore Powell and the staff of the Instructional Materials Center for Handicapped Children and Youth, who graciously played host to our visit to the IMC in Springfield.

Robert M. Anderson, Ed.D.
Associate Professor and Coordinator
Professional Laboratory Experiences
in Special Education

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Robert M. Anderson

Student teaching is considered by many educators to be one of the most important aspects of teacher education programs. It is particularly crucial that student teachers receive supervision by the most capable classroom teachers available. The development and coordination of quality student teaching situations has been a persisting problem to administrators, faculty, and students associated with university special education programs.

One critical aspect of this problem is the shortage of classroom teachers who are qualified by virtue of training and experience to supervise student teachers. In Illinois, the growth and development of University special education programs has been stimulated by the recent mandatory legislation in special education programs. The rapidly growing role of the federal government has created additional impetus, resulting in the recruitment of large numbers of students to special education programs.

Illinois State University historically has had one of the largest special education programs in the country. The current enrollment includes almost 1300 students in six areas of exceptionality. During the present year approximately 250 undergraduate students will be placed in student teaching situations. During the 1969-70 school year the number of student teachers will approach 300.

This large number of student teachers requires the services of a substantial cadre of qualified, competent supervising teachers. In today's mobile society the character of this cadre undergoes constant change. Under the pressure of mandatory legislation, teachers and supervisors who possess only minimal experience and training in special education are often pressed into service. Therefore, the task of developing and maintaining adequate student teaching sites becomes a difficult one. Moreover, a number of other universities in Illinois are in the process of developing their special education programs and they must also acquire the services of qualified supervising teachers.

Closely related to the training and experience of the supervising teacher is the knowledge of the availability of classroom instructional materials for handicapped children and the ability to select appropriate materials. There appears to be little consistency in the amount and quality of special instructional materials used in special education classrooms. There is often a major emphasis on the tool subjects with only secondary emphasis on social behavior. Many teachers cite the lack of adequate instructional materials as a major barrier to efficient classroom instruction. Until very recently, instructional materials have received only cursory attention in teacher education programs. The emphasis has been on method as opposed to material.

A second critical factor is the difficulty involved in establishing adequate communication between representatives of the University and the classroom supervising teacher. University supervisors routinely visit each student teacher once every two weeks. Most of our university supervisors and classroom supervising teachers, however, have felt the need for an opportunity to bring together all of those persons who share the responsibility of the student teaching process.

The Department of Special Education at Illinois State University works continuously to organize and implement more sophisticated training programs for teachers of exceptional children. With this objective in mind, the Coordinator of Professional Laboratory Experiences for the Department of Special Education applied for a grant through TITLE VI, ESEA, to conduct a conference for supervising teachers in special education. The proposed conference would provide an opportunity to establish closer cooperation between supervising teachers in the public schools and the University. The institute would also serve to familiarize the supervising teachers with the function and use of the various Instructional Materials Centers in the State of Illinois.

It was hoped that the proposed orientation program would result in an improved and smoothly functioning student teaching program with relatively few questions raised by student teachers and supervising teachers with respect to operational details and expectations of the program. Mutual involvement by university and school personnel could ultimately lead to improvement in the quality of education for exceptional children.

The Project was funded through TITLE VI, and a committee comprised of one person from each area of exceptionality under the chairmanship of Dr. Anderson assumed the responsibility for the implementation of the conference. The program for the two day conference included a variety of lectures, group discussions, and other activities (See Appendix A).

The specific objectives of the conference were as follows:

1. To help all of those involved in the student teaching program understand, appreciate, and achieve the goals and objectives for which the program is established.
2. To outline and discuss the philosophy and theory, principles of supervision, details of assignments, remuneration to

cooperating teachers, delineation of responsibility, and details of evaluation and reporting procedures.

3. To identify and discuss suggestions for the improvement of the entire teacher preparation program.
4. To familiarize special education teachers with the function of the Instructional Materials Center and the use of special educational materials.

The following criteria were established for the selection of participants:

Participant should:

1. Have a master's degree or equivalent.
2. Have at least three years' teaching experience.
3. Have supervised I.S.U. student teachers during the 1968-69 school year or be scheduled for supervision during the 1969-70 school year.

The supervising teachers were selected from school systems throughout the State of Illinois. The original list of teachers who were invited to participate reflected a relatively equal geographic representation of school districts used for student teaching purposes by the Special Education Department, Illinois State University. Since some of the teachers who were invited were not able to attend, a "perfect" geographic distribution was not obtained. However, the eventual geographic representation was quite satisfactory (See Appendix B).

PHILOSOPHY, THEORY, AND PRINCIPLES OF SUPERVISION

Dr. Cecilia J. Lauby

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. All of us here at Illinois State University are pleased to have you with us. We are especially happy to have you here today because we believe, as we have always believed, that you and we are partners in the professional undertaking of providing the best possible professional laboratory experience for our college students.

My assignment this morning is to bring to you an over-view of the professional laboratory experiences in which our college students engage directing particular emphasis to our student teaching program. In this over-view I was asked to include the basic philosophy and theory of supervision to which our University subscribes, as well as a brief summary of the responsibilities of those who work with student teachers.

Some of you have cooperated with us for many years; others of you only recently have been associated with us as supervising teachers. Do you know that Illinois State University is the sixth largest producer of teachers in the United States? Although the number of teachers graduating from the University is large, the University has zealously guarded its commitment to teacher education and has continued to require the acquisition of a rigorous program by its teacher candidates.

Since all of you are well acquainted with the Department of Special Education, I am sure that I do not need to make you aware of the fact that the Department of Special Education at Illinois State University is one of the most outstanding departments of special education in the United

States. This reputation is based less on the number of candidates graduated, although the numbers are large, but more on the content of the curricula which the department requires its candidates to successfully master and on the faculty who administer, teach, and supervise these candidates.

The principles and theory of supervision of student teaching to which Illinois State University subscribes can be found in our STUDENT TEACHING HANDBOOK. This handbook also includes the roles and responsibilities of those who cooperate in our student teaching program. Arrangements have been made for each of you to receive a copy of our handbook; therefore, my remarks this morning will be directed and limited to information not contained in our handbook.

First, I wish to direct your attention to the name of our institution -- Illinois State University. The "University" has always been a part of the name of our institution quite appropriately. Throughout its existence Illinois State University has included in its teacher education programs a strong preparation in those content areas basic to the field in which the student prepares to teach. In fact, the liberal arts requirement of our teacher education programs are the same as, and frequently exceed, the major and minor requirements of most liberal arts programs.

We in teacher education endorse and effectuate the philosophy that any individual who aspires to become a teacher must acquire a thorough knowledge of the academic field which he desires to teach and, in addition, must know and have the ability to execute those psychological principles and methods of teaching needed to direct the learning of others. This firm commitment of Illinois State University to the acquisition of both subject matter and professional competence is visibly displayed in our student teaching program.

All of you sitting here today know that Illinois State University has endeavored to admit into the teaching profession only those individuals who are prepared in subject-matter content and professional understanding. Also, our University entrusts the guidance, direction, and supervision of professional laboratory experiences only to those supervising teachers who meet the Illinois Standards for Student Teaching and to college supervisors who, while meeting the Standards, are knowledgeable not only in their content areas such as mental retardation, deaf and hard of hearing, visually impaired, and so forth, but who are equally well informed and prepared in the professional aspects and knowledge applicable to their area of competence.

Let me hasten to assure you that there is a third dimension involved in all professional laboratory experiences, namely the college student. Regardless of how well prepared the supervising teacher may be or how knowledgeable the college supervisor may be, either or both of you can help the college student whether he be observer, participant, or student teacher only to the extent that he is able and willing to learn.

A little more than twenty years ago vocational teacher education programs such as those in home economics and agriculture, spurred on by the federal and state governments, were the first to venture into off-campus student teaching programs. About 1948 several institutions of higher education, especially those having large enrollments in teacher education, were cognizant of the need for expanding student teaching experiences beyond campus laboratory schools because these schools were unable to provide adequate experiences for the large number of students needing these professional laboratory activities.

Prior to 1948, about 1946, the Association for Teacher Education appointed a committee to study professional laboratory experiences. Dr. John Flowers, of San Marcos, Texas, was Chairman of this committee, and ever after, that committee was referred to as the "Flowers Committee." Dr. Florence Stratemeyer, of Teachers College, Columbia University and Dr. Allen Patterson of Pennsylvania, were two other members of this committee. The committee was charged with the responsibility to study and make recommendations concerning "a new look at professional experiences which precede and follow student teaching as well as student teaching."

At this time a graduate student by the name of Margaret Lindsey was pursuing graduate work with Dr. Stratemeyer at Columbia University. Margaret expressed an interest in the work of the Flowers Committee and volunteered to do the research required by the charge given to the Flowers Committee. The results of her research, which became her doctoral dissertation, were published under the title of Laboratory School Experiences in Teacher Education.

In the spring of 1949, at the time the ACTE, the AST, and several other professional organizations were meeting in St. Louis, the decision was made to combine several of these professional groups into one organization. The combining of these organizations resulted in the formation of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education -- AACTE. As many of you may know, most of the advancement, re-appraisal, and changes which have been made in teacher education in the last twenty years resulted from the impetus exerted by AACTE which today is one of the most influential of professional organizations.

To return for a minute to Dr. Lindsey's study, you might be interested to know that principally as a result of the Lindsey study "laboratory schools" are defined today as being any school in which professional laboratory experiences are pursued and directed. Hence, laboratory schools might be located on a university campus or they might be schools which are located away from a university campus and in no way, administratively or financially, associated with a college or university.

So, about twenty years ago, not only was the concept of laboratory schools broadened but also, primarily as a result of the Lindsey study, the desire for and need of professional laboratory experiences prior to and following student teaching were proposed, documented, and recommended.

The resulting expansion of professional laboratory experiences added to the already over-burdened campus laboratory schools. The need for providing professional laboratory experiences in facilities other than campus laboratory schools became necessary. The establishment and growth of the off-campus student teaching programs were a natural outcome of the expansion of professional laboratory experiences in the total teacher education program.

Student teaching is and always has been considered to be the capstone of a teacher education program. Since student teaching is generally the culminating professional laboratory experience in a baccalaureate program of teacher education, college students engage in student teaching during the senior year.

In reviewing the resources needed to provide an expanded program of professional laboratory experiences, Illinois State University decided to move student teaching out of the campus laboratory schools to off-campus laboratory schools throughout the state of Illinois. The facts involved in making this decision included the following: (1) Student teaching is a professional laboratory experience scheduled in the senior year. (2) The programs of almost all teacher education students could be planned so that most of the required major, minor, and general education courses would be completed prior to the senior year. (3) Programs of students could be planned to include, in one of the semesters of the senior year, a "professional semester" which would include student teaching and the remaining required professional courses offered on a block-of-time basis. (4) Moving students away from the campus laboratory schools would permit the development of pre-student teaching professional laboratory experiences in the campus laboratory schools.

In the fall of 1949 Illinois State University began its off-campus student teaching program as an all-university endeavor. Those departments in the University which had the largest student enrollments were the first to send their students away from the campus for student teaching.

As the off-campus student teaching program developed, ISU began to move from a "one period a day for 18 weeks" type of student teaching to a "full day for nine weeks" type of student teaching. This latter type of student teaching was known as "full-time" student teaching. Approximately ninety-nine per cent of all student teaching at ISU today is full-time student teaching.

A few statistics will reveal the growth of full-time off-campus student teaching. During the first nine weeks of the fall of 1949, six students were scheduled for full-time student teaching off campus. By the end of that school year, approximately 106 student teachers had earned 1063 semester hours of credit in full-time off-campus student teaching. By comparison approximately 1900 student teachers earned 11,348 semester hours of student teaching credit in full-time off-campus student teaching last year. We estimate that by the time the present school year ends, some 2000 student teachers will have earned approximately 18,000 semester hours of credit in full-time off-campus student teaching.

My reason for mentioning size is to explain to you why, at times, we may not seem to know each individual student and, I am sorry to admit, we may not know each individual supervising teacher. However, the University endeavors to maintain personal relationships with you and the college students through our College Supervisors. You might be interested to know that this year ISU employed, part-time or full-time, approximately 80 college supervisors. We are also encouraged to learn, from the evaluation reports which you and the college students so graciously completed for us, that you and the college students seem to be as pleased with us and our faculty as we are with you. Let us try to retain these good working relationships as long as possible.

As we meet and visit today will each of you please identify yourself, your teaching field, and your location. Also, if you have any questions which you think I might be able to answer I am at your disposal.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to visit with you.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

Dr. George S. Richmond

The major objective of this workshop, as stated in the letter of invitation, is to provide an orientation to the student teaching program at Illinois State University. This should result in an improved student teaching program which functions smoothly and with relatively few questions raised by student teachers and supervising teachers regarding operational details and expectations of the program. Mutual involvement by university and public school personnel should ultimately lead to improvement in the quality of education of exceptional children.

With this rather auspicious and over-powering objective, may I digress. During this past year it has been my good fortune to work with the administrators of programs which you teachers represent and there are many of you with whom I have become personally acquainted. More good fortune! Additionally, I have had responsibilities associated with the elementary student teacher program. Added to this is several years of working with secondary student teachers as a public school administrator. With this range of experience why should I single out the special education programs for plaudits. Certainly not because of what the local powers expect me to say. Very sincerely I make this statement. In my experience you, the special education people, have a philosophical concept about education which, in my experience, approaches uniqueness as well as the ultimate goal. This noteworthy position is your dedication to the individual child. As was recently expressed, you as a group are committed to the proposition that each and every student is a human. I don't mean to say that the people who represent the other areas mentioned above do not believe this basic concept of education -- in my experience they don't work as hard "at it" as you do!

Dr. Lauby has covered the philosophy of student teaching at Illinois State University. I might add that, without exaggeration, I have talked with a minimum of 200 administrators, special education directors, and supervisors this year. Without exception, identification as being associated with student teaching at I.S.U. was an ample entree. I needed no additional credentials to enlist the cooperation of the special education district and/or public school system. This reputation of I.S.U.'s student teaching program has not been nurtured by chance. It has been developed by blood, sweat and tears. And Dr. Lauby, my hat is off to you!

The objective of this workshop is to provide an orientation to our program of student teaching. I would like to share with you some of the inner workings of our office. In my visits with you and your programs there have been questions raised. "Why do you do this?" Or "Why don't you do that?" Perfectly legitimate questions. Rather than attempt to answer some of these questions now, let me give a brief resume of our process -- or should we say "our thing." At the conclusion I will welcome questions from the floor. I have made certain that Dr. Lauby will be here to answer your inquiries.

Our first contact with the prospective student teacher comes in November (October) of the junior year.

From the packet of materials which I have handed you, if you will examine the Application for Student Teaching, (the yellow sheets), you will notice that the student is asked to provide some biographical information, a summary of his general training here at the university, and his preferences for student teaching. I call your attention to a few specific points.

Do you request to do your student teaching _____ on campus _____ off campus. This choice is limited, especially in some areas (EMR, Speech Correction).

Also notice the last line. We try to educate the student to departmental policies.

Items 5 and 6 on the second page may not be too germane for the students. Frequently we locate student teaching sites and assign the student without much choice.

The Information on Student Teachers (the white sheet) is the student personal data sheet with which you are familiar. As indicated earlier, the extended time period between first semester junior year and second semester senior year becomes a real problem. This is true in the listing of courses taken and expected to have taken by the time of the student teaching experience. We do strongly urge the students to be as complete, neat, and clear as possible. We tell them - somewhat threateningly - that this is their first contact with prospective employers (administrators, and with you, the classroom supervisors, who largely are responsible for final evaluations).

In the Student Teaching Handbook, we have tried to outline the roles and responsibilities of all concerned parties. To identify every possible problem situation in writing is a Herculean task. The Handbook is on occasion said to be vague and inconclusive. If this charge be true, it is a necessary characteristic of a single handbook designed to cover a wide variety of student teaching experiences.

This handbook is a revised edition of the one with which most of you are familiar. Organizationally there are some major changes. In basic philosophy, there is little change.

As I said, our first contact with the prospective student teacher comes in November.

At this time the student completes our application form indicating area of exceptionality, level of interest, geographic area, transportation, grade point average, courses taken and those to be taken. At this time the student's personal data sheet is also completed. Those students who are now teaching (May, 1969) completed their applications in November, 1967. Numerous changes can and do occur "betwixt and between" and, with the approximately 2200 student teachers, our office cannot track down all of the name changes, and the changes in boyfriends -- Springfield is no longer desired because Joe (or Mary) is now going to be in Lake County. And interests do change. As a first semester junior, the student thought primary MR was the area - now maybe junior high (or even senior high) is more attractive and desirable.

The next step is to develop for each area of exceptionality a two-way list. First we ascertain which student teaching period of the year the student desires. This is checked for balancing the loads. It is obvious that 25 students one nine weeks and none the next would pose real problems of supervision within the university. We ask the area college supervisor to balance the loads in his department. The college supervisor must also check on the student's course progress. We, in cooperation with the special education supervisor, occasionally find it necessary to move a student from first semester to second semester to provide time for a particular course prior to student teaching.

Then we work on the geographic preferences. Among the campus stories is that in PLE north is anything north of Bloomington. We try to locate students in a requested area but normally not in home towns. In special education this does pose some problems. For instance we talk about "Tinley Park District" or "Lake County" or "Lynn Wiley's district." Now what schools constitute these districts takes a full component of Mission Impossible three episodes to unravel. The point I'm making is Mary Smith is a native of LaGrange (Lew Martin) but we want to place her in Hinsdale. Not all of our student clerks are aware of the fine points. An example, and this is true, just last week a veteran supervisor called - frantically - "Where was Mary Smith doing her elementary student teaching?" Our office had said she was in Oak Park - but she wasn't. Subsequent inquiry showed she had been for 12 weeks but was now in Maywood. Communications are difficult at times even within our own office. We try -- and we ask you to try.

After assigning a student to a nine week period and geographic slot, we then determine the length of his individual assignment. We offer several alternatives! We attempt to be flexible.

First, let me discuss the sequence of our 18 week students. There are four categories:

1. deaf and hard of hearing
2. blind and partially sighted
3. EMH/TMH
4. EMH/HCPD

Students in these areas do six weeks of student teaching in each of the two areas of exceptionality and six weeks in a regular elementary classroom.

The second group is made up of students who are required to spend nine weeks in one area of exceptionality. This applies only to students enrolled in Speech Correction. As of September 1, 1969, all student teachers in this area will complete nine weeks in speech therapy.

The third group is comprised of the students who elect to take the nine week option. The MR's (I learned EMH) can elect to do nine weeks of MR or six weeks MR and three weeks elementary.

The students enrolled in the areas of the physically handicapped or socially maladjusted at present are required to complete a 6/3 assignment although some flexibility is now being permitted in this policy.

It is obvious that we cannot make a blanket statement about the most appropriate number of days which any given student spends in a particular situation. We, too, believe in individualized instruction.

Now let me turn to the selection of the "local" or "classroom supervisor." The PLE office discusses with the Special Education Director our program and our basic requirements. These requirements include:

1. Master's degree
2. Three or more years teaching experience
3. Recommendation by local Director of Special Education

I would be the first to say that we could "discuss" from now until tomorrow afternoon the Master's degree requirement. I know that each of us can document that some Miss Brown (a BS plus three semester hours and 40 years of experience) is an outstanding teacher. Yet I honestly believe that the degree is a professional milestone -- aren't most of our salary schedules predicated upon levels of education?

You have been invited to this conference as top local supervisors. Infrequently we place a student with someone who is less than "top." In extreme cases we eliminate a person from our possible list of local supervisors. Our batting average -- thanks to local directors -- is very good. If you only "strike out" once in 100 trips at bat, you're doing OK. Let me clarify a point here - we do not use every recommended local supervisor every year, or every semester. Our needs vary and perhaps we don't need as many placements in your geographic area next year as this year. This is not saying that we are dissatisfied.

College supervision assignments are largely the responsibility of the Special Education Department, not PLE. We are not greatly involved in making those assignments.

Now what do we want. Technically, we ask for two reports - the mid-term evaluation and the final evaluation. (Appendix C). Oh, we need to know if Sally Smith has been absent. And the effect of absence varies with: (1) the length of the absence, (2) the nature of the assignment, (3) the progress of the student, and (4) the time of the absence. Each case becomes almost an individual decision. The local supervisor, the college supervisor, PLE department, and the student may all become involved in the final decision.

Our general instructions say that the student is responsible for housing. You are very helpful in arranging housing and transportation. These little "nitty-gritty" details become compounded when the student spends three weeks in this school, moves ten miles across the district for the six weeks experience -- and there is no public transportation and the student has no car.

Frequently we are asked, "When should the student start actual teaching?" As a general rule, in a six weeks experience it would be expected that by the second week the student would do some teaching, and by the sixth week he would be doing most if not all of the teaching, including planning. The range of experiences is so great that it is difficult to generalize. Many variables must be considered:

1. The maturity and the experience of the student teacher
2. Her ability to establish desirable rapport with students
3. Her training and background as suited to the classroom situation
4. The size, nature, temperment of the class
5. Local school policies
6. Time of year
7. Length of experience: six weeks - nine weeks
8. The opinion of the classroom and college supervisors

We are frequently asked to define "what" experiences a student teacher should have. I feel that the student teacher should experience all responsibilities and routines with which you as the classroom teacher are confronted. If you attend PTA, so should the student. If you serve on committees, and it is appropriate, the student should attend with you. If you have lunch duty, playground duty, hall duty, bus duty - so does the student. Ideally, the student is treated as a member of the faculty entitled to all rights, privileges and responsibilities so accorded to any faculty member.

I am sure that many questions can be raised. Some are individual and localized, others are general. Dr. Lauby and I will attempt to field any or all. We will be staying throughout the lunch hour should anyone wish to speak with us privately. And the PLE office is almost always open -- 8:00-12:00, 1:00-5:00, Monday through Friday, that is.

Thank you for your kind attention. Are there questions?

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON SPEECH CORRECTION

Miss Doris M. Richards

Participants:

Off-campus:
Charlotte W. Cridland, Barrington
Eleanor L. Finley, Ottawa
Dorothy E. Gemberling, Marseilles
Adeline Glenwright, Bloomington
Ellen R. Haas, Pontiac
Charlene Mac Gregor, Chicago Ridge
Barbara J. Schneider, Elgin
Brenda Wolters, Pekin

Campus:
Dorothy W. Clark
Dorathy A. Eckelmann
Al Jean Flickinger
Merle Howard
Barbara B. Hutchinson
M. Eugene Norris
Doris M. Richards - Coordinator
Nancy Thomley
Martin A. Young

General purpose for speech correction group: to discuss student teaching procedures in our area and from this to develop some guidelines which will be helpful to both supervising teachers and students.

Friday afternoon group session--

Purposes:
1) To discuss the program as it now exists and point out strengths and weaknesses
2) To develop topics from the discussion for work groups for the meeting the following day.

An open discussion was held involving the entire group. After a few leading questions, new areas arose spontaneously.

The discussion may be summarized in two general areas: 1) the role of Professional Laboratory Experiences offices and the college supervisor; 2) the student preparation and evaluation. A third area concerning the experiences a student teacher in speech correction should have was introduced as an area of concern by the college supervisors.

In the first area all the off-campus supervisors commented that they were pleased with the role played by the college supervisor, but several stated that there was some problem in getting material from the Professional Laboratory Experience's office. They specifically commented that they like the number and regularity of visits since this gave them an adequate opportunity to clear up any problems. They also stated that they liked the campus supervisor to make comments and suggestions concerning, not only work of the student teacher, but the children who were receiving therapy.

The second area concerning the student consumed much more of the time and several topics were discussed. The evaluation of the student was of great concern to everyone. It was generally felt that the present evaluation forms are too general and that a form with areas and items more specifically related to speech correction would be most helpful. Grading of off-campus student teachers also presents a problem and there was unanimous agreement that pass-fail with a complete evaluation would be desirable. They would like the option of plus and minus grades on the mid-term evaluation. It was felt that it would be beneficial if a criterion for evaluation for student teaching could be set up so there would be more consistency from one student to another and from year to year. They agreed that our students are prepared as well as or better than students from other schools and that the gaps in experience are filled by the activities in which they participate in the public school situation; e.g., handling groups and speech improvement classes, etc.

All of the off-campus supervisors feel it would be helpful if a description of the courses required of the students was provided to amplify the list of courses which the student has had before doing his student teaching. Also, they felt more information concerning logging of clock-hours would be worthwhile.

The third area having to do with the kinds of experiences students should have in off-campus student teaching did not come from the group. This was not unexpected since the persons chosen to participate in this conference were the supervisors whom we felt were strong and gave the students the kinds of experiences which they should have. They all agreed, however, that there should be some uniformity in the basic experiences a student should be exposed to.

Saturday - Work groups

At a general meeting Saturday morning the Friday afternoon session was summarized and work groups 1) to develop an evaluation form, 2) to set up guidelines for evaluating student teachers in speech correction, and 3) to set up guidelines and recommendations for the kinds of experiences a student teacher should have, were formed. At the end of the day the results of the work groups were presented to everyone present. The report of each group is attached. Due to the limited time spent it must be recognized that these reports do not cover every aspect of the problem, and are not in the form which may ultimately be desirable.

Group I -- The Evaluation of Student Teachers in Speech Correction

Participants: Charlotte Cridland
Al Jean Flickinger
Adeline Glenwright
Nancy Thomley
Dorothy Clark, Chairman

The purpose of this group was to make an evaluation form that could be used for student teachers in speech correction which would contain items specifically related to speech therapy and speech therapists. They felt that the performance should be rated in two ways; e.g., according to quality and also according to growth shown so a student could be unsatisfactory, but showing growth; or, satisfactory, but not showing growth.

I Therapy

	Exceptional Outstanding	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Indicates Growth
A. Application of Theory 1. Has knowledge and understanding of typical and atypical speech behaviors.				
2. Establishes working relationship with client.				
B. Diagnostic Abilities 1. Ability to evaluate and describe significant (speech, language and related) behaviors.				
2. Ability to interpret and evaluate relevant professional reports.				
C. Planning 1. Prognostic planning--sets realistic long-range goals.				
2. Daily planning--significant, specific, realistic				
3. Efficiency				
a. in planning				
b. in therapy				
c. in management of materials and equipment				
d. in management of surroundings				
4. Realistic termination of therapy				
D. Meeting Needs 1. Client-therapist response patterns				
2. Perception of clients' response patterns				
3. Ability to adapt procedures to shifting needs				
4. Ongoing evaluation of client performance				

	Exceptional Outstanding	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Indicates Growth
E. Professional reporting and record keeping				
1. Punctual				
2. Relevant				
3. Concise				
4. Use of professional vocabulary				
5. Use of professional language				
6. Use of correct spelling				
7. Neatness				
8. Discrimination between perception and description of behavior				
F. Awareness of and ability to adjust to needs of client--physical surrounding				
II Student as a Person				
A. Appearance				
1. Dresses appropriate -- grooming				
2. Speech				
3. Language				
4. Voice				
5. Freedom from mannerisms				
B. Punctuality				
C. Reliability				
D. Emotional Stability				
E. Courtesy				

III Professional Person

		Exceptional Outstanding	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Indicates Growth
A.	Professional Ethics -- subscribes to a professional code of ethics applicable to the situation				
B.	Supervision - therapist relationship 1. Reacts appropriately to supervisor's criticism				
	2. Contributes to conference discussion				
	3. Willingness to seek help and build on suggestions				
C.	Relationship with other professional personnel 1. Attends professional meetings				
	2. Cooperates professionally with personnel				
D.	Professional contact with parents or family				
E.	Professional conduct 1. Courtesy				
	2. Keeping up in field				
	3. Interest in profession				

Group II -- Guidelines for Evaluating Student Teachers in Speech Correction

Participants: Ellen Haas
Charlene Mc Gregor
Barbara Schneider
M. Eugene Norris, Chairman

The purpose of this group was to discuss and suggest guidelines for critic teachers to use when rating the performance of student teachers in speech correction. All of the participants felt that traditional grading of practicum had serious limitations, and such a letter grade does not always reflect a student's strengths and weaknesses. Each member favored a pass-fail grade accompanied by a comprehensive evaluation of the various parameters of performing as a speech correctionist. The group also expressed concern with the weight or importance of some items traditionally included on many evaluation forms--i.e., appearance, theoretical knowledge, and practical skill; can one equate an "A" in appearance with an "A" in skill? Which is more important?

At first the group listed the items they thought should be evaluated and then tried to define what the average performance should be. However, this proved to be not without problems and it was decided to first define what the top performance in an area was rather than "average." It was also decided not to label a level of performance as A, B, or C so as to avoid associating a letter grade with performance at this stage of developing guidelines.

Limitation of time prevented the group from setting levels of performance for all items listed. Below are the ones discussed; three criteria of performance are given for each item with the top level being listed first. It is recognized that these may be broken down and/or further expanded to whatever number of levels one would desire on a rating scale.

I Appearance

1. It is expected of ISU student teachers that their dress and appearance is appropriate in style, cleanliness, and use of cosmetics and accessories is not distracting. A student is not expected to have a large wardrobe.

2. Appearance sometimes inappropriate, overdressed, and not always practical for working in the therapy environment.

3. Clothes not pressed and appearance is distracting to clients to the point of disrupting the learning situation.

II Dependability

1. Student is on time and present when expected. Therapy materials and plans are ready to use and organized. Prompt notification of deviations from schedule or absences for legitimate reasons.

2. Organization of materials, plans, and time is inconsistent. Occasional absence or tardiness without justification.

3. Seldom organized; frequent absence and tardiness, minimal preparation.

III Flexibility and/or Adaptability

1. Able to accept various circumstances without losing poise in most situations. Accepts suggestions with evidence of appropriate response and discussion.

2. Adapts to most circumstances and accepts suggestions. In general, will respond with appropriate action.

3. Does not always accept suggestions and may even seem to resent them; seldom follows through with appropriate action.

IV Therapy

1. Uses techniques and creates material which is imaginative, promotes learning, and takes advantage of opportunities of the moment.

2. Uses appropriate techniques which are suitable for promoting learning, but shows little imagination and creative use of materials.

3. Uses only materials available; shows little or no initiative in planning and use of what material is available.

V Rapport

1. Creates an environment and appropriate relationship with others that is conducive to a learning situation with discipline and control.

2. May provide learning environment with clients, but may not be consistent in maintaining relationship with others (parents, teachers, and/or client) to create optimum learning environment.

3. Limits rapport to just being agreeable and pleasant which may not always be conducive to learning.

VI Other Areas

1. Knowledge of subject
2. Projected growth and success
3. Insight

Group III -- Guidelines and Recommendations for Kinds of Experiences the Student Teacher should have in his off-campus Student Teaching and some of the responsibilities of the supervising teacher.

Participants: Eleanor Finley
Dorothy Gemberling
Brenda Wolters
Dorathy Eckelmann, Chairman

BASIC GUIDELINES

1. The off-campus student teaching experience in speech correction should provide the student teacher not only with the opportunity of acquiring 100 clock hours of experience in the public school setting but also with the best over-all introduction to the speech therapist's role in the public school setting.

2. It should be clearly understood that the first obligation of the supervising teacher is to her own school district and to her clients. It is hoped that the interests of her clients and the student teacher can be served simultaneously without conflict. Therefore, it is recommended that:

  - a. A public school therapist should not be required to have more than two student teachers during the year and that the nine-week supervisory periods should not fall consecutively.
  - b. When a speech therapist feels that it is not in the best interest of the client to transfer the therapy session to the student teacher or to have the student teacher observe, the supervising teacher should have no hesitancy in retaining him for therapy. However, it would be most desirable that an explanation of the rationale for this procedure be given to the student teacher, and that the plan and progress of such a therapy be discussed with him.

3. Since it is expected that this pre-professional experience be as much the "real thing" as possible, the student teacher should be accorded as much as possible the orientation a new teacher would receive.
   - a. It should be the responsibility of the supervising teacher to introduce him to the children and the school personnel; to acquaint him with the pertinent rules, regulations, and operation of the school.
   - b. It is hoped that the student will dress and behave in a professional manner at all times, and the student should be briefed if necessary in this respect.
   - c. As any new teacher needs to know that his performance is acceptable, the student teacher is also anxious in this respect. Therefore, evaluations should not wait until midterm or the end of the term, but should be given either formally or informally throughout the experience, and he should be challenged to evaluate his own performance. Some

supervisors find it desirable to give students verbal or written comments each day.

d. In so far as possible, acquaint him with the administrative set-up of the school system and some of the administrative problems.

KINDS OF EXPERIENCES DESIRED FOR THE STUDENT SPEECH CLINICIAN

Note: It is not always possible to provide all of the experiences given below, but whenever possible and at the discretion of the supervising teacher, it is felt that these kinds of experiences would be desirable.

1. An opportunity to see senior therapists, including the supervisor, at work. Opportunity for discussing these observations should be provided.
2. An opportunity to observe in the classroom, particularly the special classes such as E.M.H., T.M.H., and the reading and language programs in the regular rooms.
3. An opportunity to become acquainted with special services programs, and materials available in the school system; for example: health, psychological, and social services, instructional teaching centers, and other instructional resources.
4. Involvement in staffings, parent conferences, building meetings, etc.
5. Involvement in pertinent extra-curricular activities--P.T.A., social events, community programs.
6. Involvement in extra-school professional activities: area speech meetings, Council for Exceptional Children, community programs.

7. Acquaintance with pertinent tools of the profession: books tests, commercial materials, etc.

8. Acquaintance with various therapy techniques and experiences:
    a. Screening and diagnostic evaluations
    b. Planning and evaluation of therapy
    c. Experience with a diversity of problems and ages
    d. Experience in handling groups
    e. Experience in experimenting with new approaches and helping him evaluate these.
    f. An opportunity to use the materials and methods of the supervisor for part of his experience.
    g. An opportunity to prepare materials of his own for part of his experience.
    h. An opportunity to read case records and reasonable experience in the preparation of running records and the various kinds of reports needed.
    i. Speech improvement in the classroom.

9. While observation of the senior therapist is encouraged, and the student therapist may increasingly assume the responsibility for carrying out the program, it is strongly recommended that he have the experience of carrying the entire program for a minimum period of five weeks.

10. Related experiences which seem desirable:
    a. Preparation of bulletin boards and responsibility for care of the physical condition of the therapy room and equipment.

b. Responsibility for maintaining acceptable discipline while student is in charge of therapy.

c. Acquaintance throughout his experience with the need and importance of observing professional ethics.

d. Acquaint with manuscript writing and the reading philosophy and materials used in the school.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Dr. Geraldine K. Fergen

Prior to the workshop the participants in this discussion group identified improvement needs in a) supervision, b) the teaching-learning process, c) educational programming. Their needs, then became the basis for the several discussions.

Five meetings were held: May 9 - 6 P.M. - an indoor (due to inclement weather) picnic, Fairchild Hall Lounge; May 10 - 9:00 to 10:30 A.M.; 11:00 to 12:30 P.M. - Solarium, Fairchild Hall; 12:45 to 1:45 P.M. Luncheon - at the Steak House; 2:00 to 4:00 P.M. - Solarium, Fairchild Hall. A coffee time from 10:30 to 11:00 A.M. was held with the participants from Groups I and III.

The members of Group IV, Physically Handicapped area included:

Miss Sandra Rausch - Riverside
Mr. Robert Abbott - Waukegan
Miss Edith Wells - Chicago
Mr. Virgil Kolb - Chicago
Miss Jean Dooley - Peoria
Miss Carolyn Roserberry - Peoria
Mr. William Muehlhauser - Downers Grove
Mrs. Betty Woodson - Normal
Mr. Gus Lown - Bloomington
Miss Geraldine Fergen - Normal

The following prospective teachers, Illinois State University, were present:

Carol Reid
Joan Moticka
Judy Moschel
Marcia Mallory
Frances Schneider
Corrine Reed
Paul Baker

The purpose of the discussions was to afford suggestive solutions for the identified problems.

AREA I. Supervision

Problem: The need for an exchange of evaluative methods

Suggestions: Conferences, check lists, self-evaluation forms, forms for evaluating teaching plans

The group decided to submit any forms now being used from above listing for duplication and thus exchange these among themselves; to initiate a round robin of any new information on evaluation; and to create specific evaluative forms appropriate for the area of the physically handicapped.

Problem: Depth of professional activity to be required of prospective teacher.

Suggestions: Those activities in which the supervising teacher participates and these to clearly include: a) school activities, b) in-service training; c) professional organization meetings

The group also felt that special educators have a responsibility in enhancing understanding of exceptionalities. Non-handicapped need to observe the handicapped in positive performance.

Problem: Final grading of prospective teachers

Suggestions: The group unanimously favored the Pass-Fail system.

AREA II. The Teaching-Learning Process

Problem: Does prescriptive teaching have a place in this area of teaching?

Suggestions: In general, yes. It is predicated, however, on adequate education diagnosis to include the child's best known learning mode; language ability; concept formation; experiential repertoire and perceptualization ability. The need here is for clinical-teaching as a part of the special teachers training program. Such techniques must also be provided for in-service teachers. This, with adequate supportive diagnostic personnel, would bring learning needs and the teaching process into sharper focus. In essence, prescriptive teaching is individualized instruction.

Problem: Correlating the various therapy needs with the classroom learning process.

Suggestions: Frequent staffings, weekly objective sheets

Problem: Should admission-dismissal and staffing teams be required?

Suggestions: Yes. Admission-dismissal groups review diagnostic criteria and progress reports. The composition of the groups should be flexible. Their authority for pupil educational placement is delegated legally by the administrator(s) of the school district(s).

The staffing team is comprised of individuals with specific diagnostic expertise. Their recommendations should be sent to the admission-dismissal group for action.

AREA III. Educational Programming

Problem: Is there a need for some type of unification of information, teaching planning etc., among the several types of location assignments? (Special class; special school; home bound instruction; resource room guidance; hospital teaching)?

Suggestions: Yes. Conferences and/or meetings of these teachers and administrative personnel should be regularly scheduled. This could assist in curriculum planning; anticipated placement information; pupil accountability; individual pupil planning.

Problem: Is there a true decline in incidence of physical disorders?

Suggestions: While integration of these children in regular schools is accelerating at a rapid pace the decrease in mortality is phenomenal. Likewise, the increase in some diseases has been noted. Accountability of these children needs attention. Census and school registration lists should be compared. Private schools, courts, church personnel, health service groups, etc., should be apprised of school special services and be encouraged to make referrals. Personal contact recruitment on the part of school personnel and mass media publication could assist in accounting for these children. The California plan should be reviewed for adoption.

Problem: Public awareness of educational programs

Suggestions: Public Relations Committees, newsletters, open house programs, in-service programs, visitation days, Parent-Teacher-Association support.

Problem: How and when should children with physical handicaps be integrated with non-handicapped?

Suggestions: We need to have a special committee review the several guidelines available; seek out all research findings; hold further group discussions on the problem.

Problem: The need for teachers of the physically handicapped at the secondary level.

Suggestions: Training programs need to differentiate this level from the elementary -- in both psychology and practicum courses. The academic or subject major might best be guidance and counseling or mental health. The differentiated programs should be advertised by the colleges and universities for purposes of recruiting students.

The group suggested that teachers of the physically handicapped organize as a division of the Illinois Council for Exceptional Children.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED

Miss Evelyn J. Rex

Seven teachers of the visually handicapped attended the conference for supervising teachers. One person represented the residential school program and the remainder represented the day school programs. One was a teacher of the partially seeing only; four were teachers of the blind and two have combination programs of blind and partially seeing. In the original invitations to the conference there was a balance as to type of children taught but two teachers of the partially seeing were not able to attend at the last minute.

A letter was sent by Miss Rex to participants in the area of the visually handicapped prior to the conference. The intent of the letter was to stimulate thinking prior to the conference with respect to topics which might be discussed. Miss Rex indicated that an item which should receive high priority was the evaluation forms used by supervising teachers. For a number of years teachers have indicated that many items on the form were not applicable to student teachers in the area of the visually handicapped who function in resource rooms and itinerant programs.

Following the general sessions on Friday, the teachers of the visually handicapped met to determine items to pursue during the all-day session on Saturday. After a general agreement to review evaluation forms, the group had an informal question-answer sharing time. The following items were discussed.

1. Teachers requested that the college supervisor spend more time observing the student in a teaching situation and evaluating

the performance with the student. This has been a major weakness during this past school year.

2. Questions were raised about the time of the supervisor's visit. It was explained that campus responsibilities, such as classes, necessitated that the visit be made on certain days of the week but that there should be rotation between morning and afternoon visits to permit observation of the student teacher in various activities and, in the case of the itinerant teacher, in various schools.
3. Much of the discussion involved the orientation of the student teacher to the program and the program to the student. Some suggestions were:
    a. A letter to the staff to acquaint them with the student teacher prior to her arrival.
    b. A similar letter to parents.
    c. Name tags for student teacher, children and other key persons.
    d. Introduction to regular teachers early in the student teaching assignment. It is recognized that this is not possible in some schools which have very large faculties.
4. It was agreed that the supervising teacher's attitude toward the student teacher determines the children's reactions to the student teacher. Some suggestions to keep such attitudes positive ones were:
    a. Regard the person as a colleague and assistant, not another student in the group. Some call the person an assistant teacher. Others use the term "first-year teacher" and tell the children she will be helping at first and teaching later.

b. Permit the student to assume responsibilities, as he is ready.

c. Avoid correcting the student in front of the children. If it is necessary, do so in a manner which doesn't cause the children to lose respect for the student teacher.

d. Provide opportunities for the student teacher to work with the regular teacher independent of the supervising teacher. This can include conferences, preparation of materials, working with and observing the child in the regular class.

There was general consensus that the practicum experience should begin earlier. Supervising teachers would like to see a student teaching experience during the junior year. They did not view junior participation as fulfilling this. Junior participation was viewed as a necessary requirement. The first student teaching experience might be a short period once daily. The full-time student teaching basis would follow in another semester.

The group of eight persons met again Saturday for the entire day. The time was devoted to a discussion of the evaluation of the student teacher. Most of the time was spent in reviewing the evaluation form. Guidelines were developed for each item of the form to relate it to the unique situation of the teacher of the visually handicapped who functions in a resource or itinerant program. The guidelines will be made available for all supervising teachers.

There was also discussion concerning the evaluation of the supervising teacher. One supervisor passed out a form she uses with her students.

There was a strong recommendation that such a meeting be held annually. Some new teachers should be added to the group each year. It was felt that the sessions, general and special, had been extremely valuable. The teachers were grateful for the opportunity to meet with one another to talk about their common experiences and problems of supervision. The meeting made them feel a part of the University faculty and their part in the preparation of teachers.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING

Miss Vivian R. Tasker

The teachers of the deaf had a very worthwhile discussion centered around Student Teacher - Supervising Teacher conferences and planning. One teacher was from the Illinois School for the Deaf, one was a representative from the classes for the deaf in Metcalf Laboratory School, one was a nursery school teacher who has worked in a team teaching situation in a preschool class for the deaf in the public schools for some time, and the rest were from public school programs for the deaf.

In addition to the general responsibilities of supervising teachers outlined in the Student Teaching Handbook, the group concentrated on the type of guidance and direction that is needed by a student teacher as he/she gains experience in the classes for the deaf in Illinois. The following points were brought out in the discussion:

1. Observation

There were various opinions regarding how long a student should observe a class before he/she is assigned to do some teaching. It was generally agreed that all students need to observe a day or two in order to learn names of children, daily routine and schedule and the supervising teacher's techniques of handling the group. However, since the students in our program have had two semesters of observation and participation with deaf children prior to student teaching, they are ready and eager to begin some teaching the first week. With some students it is helpful to have them alternate between observing and teaching in order to benefit from seeing how a Master teacher handles a particular lesson or situation. After the first few days of this type of activity, a regular assignment is made in which the student teacher is responsible for planning and preparing materials as well as presenting the lesson(s). The amount of teaching the student does during the day should gradually be increased each week so that by the last week of the assignment he/she should be responsible for planning and teaching all lessons to the entire class. In some cases a supervising teacher may feel that the student teacher is not able to manage the entire group and therefore would make assignments accordingly.

2. Lesson Plans

Most teachers have their own favorite way of writing lesson plans, but it was felt by the group that student teachers need to write rather detailed lesson plans. In some cases where the student shows unusual ability during the first three weeks, the supervising teacher does not require as much detail in the plans for the remainder of the assignment.

All lesson plans should be checked by the supervising teacher at least a day or two ahead so that students have enough time to make changes and prepare materials as suggested by the supervising teacher. Some students need more help than others in writing plans and some may even need to teach from the supervising teacher's plans during the first week. Lesson plans which show clear objectives, materials needed and a logical, sequential procedure for developing a lesson should be required as part of the student teaching experience. Often a well thought-out plan, when written out, will help the student improve in his/her presentation of a lesson.

3. Conferences

   a. Since it is possible in many situations to give "on the spot" suggestions to a student teacher without the children knowing, this seems to be most helpful for some students. Others prefer to have the supervising teacher jot down suggestions and go over them together at the end of the day or during a planning period that day.

   b. A daily discussion with the student teacher is necessary in order to (1) help the student evaluate his own teaching; (2) make suggestions for improving techniques, and/or materials; (3) make suggestions for improving rapport and/or discipline to gain better control; and (4) make plans for the next day (or week).

   c. A mid-term conference is needed to discuss the progress being made by the student teacher in the various aspects of teaching. He needs to be able to evaluate his own work, to know where he needs to show improvement as well as to be encouraged if he is doing a good job.

   d. The final conference serves to again review the over-all progress that has been made. The student's strengths in teaching should be brought out as well as the areas in which he needs to continue working hard to improve.

4. Evaluation Form

Part of the discussion time was spent in discussing the evaluation form presently used by Illinois State University for the students in Education of the Deaf. Some very good suggestions were made for revisions which will be made in forms to be used this next year. A copy of the revised form follows.

5. Instructional Materials

On Saturday morning the group went to Springfield to tour the Instructional Materials Center.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Special Education
Education of Hearing Impaired Children

EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHER

STUDENT ____________________ COOPERATING TEACHER ____________

Student Teaching Period (Dates) ____ Date (First Evaluation) ________

Please use the same medium (pencil, blue ink, etc.) for the First Evaluation date, checks, and comments.

School ____________________

Grade or Level ______________ Date (Second Evaluation) ________

Please check the appropriate boxes, using the ratings. Leave an area box blank if there has been insufficient opportunity to evaluate this area or if comments would do more adequately.

Use spaces below the rating boxes for any comments you may wish to make.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
1. Personal Traits--tact; patience; consideration; emotional control; temperament; freedom from mannerisms; general mental health; general attitude; sense of humor					
2. Character--honesty; fairness; sincerity; tolerance; maturity; promptness; perseverance; reliability; initiative; independence; industry; ability to accept responsibility					
3. Appearance--neatness; grooming; posture; appropriate dress; poise					
4. Speech--clearness; freedom from defects and mannerisms; voice quality; volume, clarity for speechreading; speed and phrasing					

	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
5. Language--correctness, clarity of expression, vocabulary in oral English, written English; ability to use language and vocabulary appropriate to children; handwriting; spelling					
6. Mental Traits--good judgment; open-mindedness; intellectual honesty; curiosity; logic of thought; critical ability; ability to accept criticism and profit from it					
7. Cooperation--relations with cooperating teacher, school personnel, parents, students					
THE STUDENT TEACHER AS A CLASSROOM TEACHER 1. Knowledge of Subject a. Knowledge of language development at the level taught b. Knowledge of academic areas appropriate to that level (arithmetic, social studies, science, etc.) c. Ability to integrate subject matter with language and communication skills; e.g. speechreading, speech and use of residual hearing d. Accuracy of all information taught e. Understanding of interrelationships between various areas of knowledge					
2. Planning Learning Activities a. Ability to select objectives appropriate to the needs of the group and the material being presented b. Ability to state these objectives clearly c. Ability to plan the means for determining the extent to which the objectives have been accomplished d. Meet the requirements of the cooperating teacher regarding lesson plans					

	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
3. Teaching Techniques					
a. Selection of learning experiences appropriate to objectives					
b. Organization and proper sequencing of the learning experiences					
c. Variety of procedures used					
d. Ability to foresee and plan the resolution of possible difficulties that might be encountered					
e. Ability to take motivation into account in planning lessons					
f. Ability to evaluate his own teaching objectively					
4. Presentation					
a. Ability to motivate, stimulate and hold the interest of the students					
b. Ability to take advantage of situations that permit transfer of learning and also create situations to make transfer possible					
c. Ability to present a lesson in an organized, sequential order; awareness of stages within a lesson: review of known material, introduction of new material, presentation, discussion, practice, and summary					
d. Ability to utilize a variety of techniques appropriate to the group (homogeneous or heterogeneous) to present the material and to clarify difficulties					
e. Ability to utilize time so that the maximum amount of learning is accomplished in the minimum amount of time					
f. Ability to recognize individual interests, levels of learning, and needs within the group and provide adequately for these differences					
g. Sensitivity to the reactions of the group and individuals and the ability to adjust instruction immediately					

	Unsatis-factory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excel-lent
h. Flexibility while teaching in terms of pacing, lesson time, content etc. while maintaining a proper balance between flexibility and adherence to the work planned					
i. Ability to incorporate language and communication skills (both planned and incidental) into presentations in all content areas.					
j. Ability to take advantage of incidents which occur unexpectedly and utilize them in providing worthwhile learning experiences					
k. Ability to hold students responsible to the highest language and communication standards of which they are capable					
l. Ability to provide clear and definite seatwork assignments or other follow-up material and activities to reinforce and extend concepts learned during the lesson					
m. Skill in communicating with deaf children in terms of their level of vocabulary development and sentence structure					
AVERAGE FOR #4					

Any additional comments on #4 - Presentation

	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
5. Skill in the Classroom					
a. Ability to establish and maintain appropriate order in and out of the classroom through appropriate techniques. (Example: Anticipating and guarding against problem-causing situations; keeping students constructively occupied; keeping "in touch" with all students in the classroom while they are involved in a variety of activities; develop self-control within the children, etc.)					
b. Ability to analyze types of errors made by pupils and adapt plans to review and clarify these learning difficulties					
c. Ability to lead the children to discovery and independent thinking through skillful questioning on their level					
d. Skill in developing responsibility on the part of the students to use their best language and communication skills at all times					
e. Ability to keep all students constructively involved throughout the class period					
6. Classroom Management					
a. Keep orderly, attractive, and as physically comfortable as possible					
b. Gives instruction in and holds children responsible for proper care and use of books, supplies, and amplification equipment					
c. Keeps all records up to date, including samples of each child's work showing his progress					
d. Is well prepared for the day's work before class begins and makes good use of planning time					

Page 6	Unsatis-factory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excel-lent
7. Understanding of Pupils a. Ability to develop good personal relationships with the pupils b. Awareness of the ability and progress of each child in the group c. Is fair and objective in dealing with children at all times d. Gains the confidence and respect of the children e. Insight into child behavior					
8. Teaching Materials a. Selects suitable teaching materials for the level taught b. Adapts material when those available are not wholely suitable c. Creativity and originality in developing teacher-made materials to fill all gaps d. Ability to make effective use of all teaching materials, audio-visual aids and equipment					
THE STUDENT TEACHER AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION					
1. Attitudes Toward Teaching--Interest in teaching as a profession; initiative and enthusiasm in professional activity; professional discretion, reliability and loyalty					
2. Ability to Work With Others--Desire and ability to establish satisfactory personal and professional relationships with school personnel as well as with students and parents					
3. Probable Success As A Teacher					
4. Knowledge of, and Participation in Professional Organizations					

Any additional comments may be written on the back of this page.

Signature of Cooperating Teacher ____________________ Date ____________

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL MALADJUSTMENT AND LEARNING DISABILITIES

Mr. Kenneth R. Beckman

Background and Need

For a number of years there has been a need for closer dialogue with the public school personnel who supervise our student teachers. It is especially important in the area of the emotionally disturbed-socially maladjusted-learning disability group since training programs and practicum programs do not always prove to be contiguous.

Therefore, we made an effort in our selection of participants to insure geographic distribution. In addition, it was hoped that representatives from the three areas designated by the State of Illinois as Type A, B, and C (Type A, emotionally disturbed; Type B, learning disabilities; and Type C, socially maladjusted) would also be represented.

There have been some instances in the past in which students who had not been prepared in the area of learning disabilities had been placed in Type B classes for their student teaching. This happened because some classes for children with learning disabilities were labeled maladjusted, and our students were incorrectly placed in these classes. The result of this confusion was that some of our students were placed in situations for which they were not prepared, and, as a result, were not given an opportunity to demonstrate their real proficiency. Another affect of this mixed placement was that the classroom or supervising teachers were required to do a great deal more than a reasonable amount of preparation in order to bring the student to an adequate level of proficiency so that they could function in this particular classroom.

Each of the selected participants was sent a letter soliciting their participation and suggesting the following topics for discussion. It should be noted that the participants represented mental health residential facilities, public school classrooms, and public school itinerant programs.

I. Areas of Preparation
    a. Do you think our students are adequately prepared?
    b. Do you feel they need better preparation?

II. Evaluation
    a. Rationale
    b. Adequacy of the forms

III. Supervision
    a. How can we improve classroom supervision?
    b. How can we improve college supervision?

Results of Discussion Group Proceedings

One of the first topics initiated in our discussion group dealt with the preparation of the students. The concensus of opinion among the participants seemed to be that our students are broadly enough prepared, but they lack depth in the areas of educational tests and testing and knowledge of learning theory. They need to be more knowledgable with respect to the psychiatric and psychoanalytic terminology used in dealing with the emotionally disturbed, and they need greater depth in familiarity with curricular materials and their adaptations to the special area in which they plan to teach. It was also suggested that course work and practicum in behavior modification and/or some form of conditioning should be included in the curriculum.

Evaluation of Student Teachers

In view of the foregoing statements relative to the preparation of our students, it was felt that the rationale for the evaluation system used by Illinois State University is adequate. However, it was felt that the period of time in which student teaching is done provides an exposure of the student to only a minimum amount of experience upon which an adequate evaluation may be prepared. In short, our participants felt that the period of student teaching ought to be extended to a minimum of nine weeks and possibly eighteen weeks, with the additional recommendation that in the area of the emotionally disturbed, the program ought to be conducted with a one-year internship.

There was very little discussion on the subject of the adequacy of the forms used to evaluate students. It was generally felt that nothing should be done about the forms at this time. However, this might be a subject to be discussed more specifically in another meeting of this kind.

Supervision of Student Teachers

In general, when we discussed how we could improve classroom supervision of student teachers, it was felt by most of the supervising teachers that the lack of preparation in the specialized areas previously mentioned precludes certain student teaching assignments. It was pointed out by the moderator that each student teaching supervisor must be willing to engage in a certain amount of specialized teaching in order to help the student teacher fit into the situation in which he finds himself. It was further suggested that no two student teaching situations are the same, even though they might be housed in the same type of facility located in a different area of the state. For this reason, each supervising teacher has a special responsibility in the matter of supervision peculiar to his own setting.

There was reasonable agreement relative to the college supervision in terms of frequency and purpose. Since two of the participants had not had student teachers from Illinois State University, the function of the college supervisor was discussed briefly. An important point which was brought out in this discussion dealt with the college supervisor's responsibility to the classroom teacher as well as to the college student. Another aspect of supervision had to do with the receipt of the appropriate forms at the appropriate time. All new supervising teachers should have their student teaching handbook and all of the introductory materials prior to receiving the students. These should be mailed rather than hand carried by the college supervisors who arrive sometime during or after the first week of the assignment.

Special Problems Related to Student Teaching

The representatives of the mental health zone centers made a special plea for the special orientation of students planning to do their student teaching in zone centers. In the zone centers at Champaign and Decatur, on-going research projects are in progress, and, because of these, students should be oriented in terms of the kinds of activities in which they will be engaging should they be accepted for student teaching in the zone center. In cases where "outsiders" have been inserted into classrooms in which research projects are being conducted, there have been varying degrees of regression in the behavior of the subjects. This creates some difficulty with statistical treatment of the project. Therefore, it is necessary that the student teachers be adequately prepared to adapt to this specialized setting, and that they be adequately grounded in the terminology and theory of the methodology being used. It was suggested that the six-week student teaching period was much too short. When dealing with emotionally disturbed children, the introduction of new faces continuously creates many more problems than it solves.

Because of this, it was recommended that we should probably not plan to have student teachers at Adler Zone Center unless they could be there at least a semester. This recommendation was supported by the representatives of the other zone centers in attendance.

A significant recommendation was made that a follow-up meeting be held with the teachers and directors of the zone centers and the teacher training personnel at I.S.U. The primary objective would be to identify and attempt to ameliorate problems peculiar to the training of student teachers at zone centers.

Recommendation

The following recommendations were developed and listed in order of their priority.

1. The I.S.U. staff should meet with zone center directors and classroom supervising teachers at an early date to determine what should be expected of student teachers and what can be done to implement these needs.

   The role of the zone center in the process of "on-the-site" instruction should also be discussed.

   Length of the student teaching period should be discussed in terms of nine week assignments.

2. Course requirements should be modified to include course work that relates specifically with situations leading to familiarity with behavior modification techniques, conditioning, learning theory and staffing terminology and procedures.

3. A separate course should be developed on educational tests and measurements, covering the rationale for testing the construction of test items and interpretation of test results.

4. A special section of the practicum course should be related to curriculum materials and their use.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Miss Judith J. Smithson

Group discussions for teachers of the educable mentally retarded and trainable mentally retarded were conducted on Friday afternoon and Friday evening. One statement made by a supervising teacher seemed to summarize the success of the conference---"While I don't think I'm guilty of some of the questionable practices described during this conference, I do feel that I will profit from the mistakes which I have heard others relate and I will be able to avoid many mistakes which I might have made in future supervisory assignments."

There was much lively discussion and many relevant suggestions were made during the afternoon session. Since this session followed the student panel presentation and since one student participated in our group meeting, the participants were quite interested in what the students had to say and they seemed to feel that hearing it directly from the students was most valuable.

One area of concern was the rationale and procedures for assigning letter grades to student teachers. Most of the participants were of the opinion that grades should be abolished and student teaching should be done on a pass-fail basis. The point was made that there is little agreement among supervisors with regard to the quality of behavior necessary to earn a grade of "A", "B", or "C." The discussants did not feel that the grades were very meaningful to the students and that, therefore, they should be discontinued.

There were many questions regarding observation in the classroom, including the length of the observation period, the type of observation, and the most appropriate times for observation. There was agreement that these questions must be answered individually by each teacher, based on many factors related to each teacher, each group of children, and each physical facility.

Methods of cooperative program planning between the supervising teacher and the student teacher were discussed, and the teachers seemed to feel that they had gained some understanding of how to include their student teacher in long and short term planning.

The supervising teachers recommended that since the grades which they assigned to the students would probably have some effect on the future of the students, and since the students future employment might be contingent upon the letters of recommendation written by the supervising teacher for each student, that the students should also have an opportunity to evaluate the supervising teacher. It was felt that an evaluation of this sort would provide the supervising teacher with greater insight into his own strengths and weaknesses and, consequently, this should be useful to him in working with other student teachers in the future. One supervising teacher observed that perhaps some students would be too critical of their supervising teacher or would be reluctant to express their candid opinions because of concern about the consequences of writing a negative evaluation. Most of the supervisors, however, felt that the majority of students were mature enough to make a fair, objective, evaluation of their supervising teachers. It was suggested that an appropriate time for this evaluation to be submitted might be the first week after the student has completed his assignment.

Few of the supervisors felt that it was their task and responsibility to make an "A" student out of every student teacher in order to feel successful. One supervisor seemed to think that she should have guilty feelings if each of her student teachers did not progress to the point of being an excellent teacher. General consensus on this issue was that some supervisors might help their students to make a great deal of progress, yet fall short of a grade of "A" simply because they were not exceptionally able student teachers and probably would not be regardless of the efforts of any supervising teacher. Again, we were reminded that personalities, physical facilities, the character of the school or school system, and the numerous student teacher variables all play important roles in what can be accomplished.

There was some discussion of the student teaching assignments, which included a three week regular elementary assignment. There were differing opinions with respect to whether or not the three week elementary assignment should precede or follow the six week assignment in a class for the mentally retarded. Some of the supervising teachers thought that the three week elementary assignment should come first inasmuch as it would provide the student with some valuable experience prior to the special class assignment.

Others felt that it was best to do the special education assignment first and acquire confidence in classroom management before the very brief three week duration of managing a much larger regular classroom.

Those proposing the three-week elementary assignment first argued that the student teachers needed to understand the operation and expectations in the elementary classroom before they could be placed in a special classroom to teach. Those who were arguing for the six-week assignment in special education first did not feel that this was of importance as they felt it could come at the end and the same purpose would be accomplished. A consensus of opinion was not reached on this issue to make an accurate recommendation in this particular matter.

Dr. Hemenway discussed with the group the availability and use of instructional materials in the classroom and the need to "educate" their student teachers on the use of curriculum materials. Some of the participants felt that our students had considerable knowledge in this area while others expressed negative opinions. The participants suggested that students should begin early to make personal lists of materials with which they were familiar and to continually field test these materials at every opportunity. Several of the supervising teachers pointed out that our students lacked sophistication in the use of "hardware," such as projectors, tape recorders, etc. A few supervising teachers thought it was their responsibility to teach these skills to their student teachers while others considered this to be the responsibility of the University. All were in agreement that the relatively new area of "instructional media" needed to be emphasized more in teacher education programs and in classroom situations.

The discussion group unanimously agreed that the conference was most worthwhile inasmuch as it provided an opportunity for face-to-face interaction and discussion of problems and issues which were common to college supervisors, classroom supervising teachers and student teachers. The participants hoped that future conferences would be conducted and that they would have opportunities to again be involved. A recommendation was made that supervising teachers who considered themselves to be inexperienced or who felt that they lacked skill in working with student teachers should be included in workshop conferences since they would have a great deal to gain. The supervising teachers were quite receptive to suggestions made by the students and they felt that getting feedback directly from the students was extremely beneficial.

One of the purposes of this afternoon meeting was to design more appropriate forms to use in communicating the strengths and weaknesses of our student teachers. It was the consensus of the group that the present forms, while not designed specifically for Special Education, were adequate if conferences were held with the student teachers, supervising teachers, and the college supervisor. They stressed the need for daily conferences with the supervising teachers and student teachers in order to make the student teaching situation a valuable learning experience. It was their recommendation that the forms remain uniform, with the observations and conferences being used more appropriately.

On Saturday, this group of supervising teachers was taken to Springfield to the Instructional Materials Center for Handicapped Children and then to the Spring Conference of the Illinois Counsel for Exceptional Children. At the Instructional Materials Center they were hosted by personnel of that office and shown new materials and then given the opportunity to browse and study on their own. They were then given the opportunity to sign out materials that they wished to use in their classrooms and with their student teachers. At the conference of the ICEC the Instructional Materials Center Mobile Unit was on exhibit for additional service to our group. They were permitted to again take those materials with them which they felt would be beneficial for use in their classroom. At the luncheon served at the ICEC Conference they heard a report on legislation in Illinois regarding special education and the future of special education. They were given helpful hints on how to go about influencing legislation and steps to follow if they desired to initiate legislation. Then the group was broken into small groups to discuss and to hear first hand what was happening around the State of Illinois in specific areas and to specific areas of special education.

While this was a rather rigorous program and strenuous in many aspects, the participants all agreed that they would welcome the opportunity to do it again for the value they received from this conference.

MYTHS OR REALITIES

Judith J. Smithson

The meaning of the term Student Teaching undergoes subtle changes as a senior student looks forward to it, as the beginning teacher meets her class for the first time, and as the master teacher supervises the student teacher. A panel was appointed consisting of junior students planning to do student teaching in a few months, students who had just completed their student teaching, one graduate student, and one new teacher. The purpose of the panel was to identify problem areas and to delineate suggestions for the improvement of the entire teacher preparation program. Some of the panelists had experienced very good student teaching assignments while others had been exposed to rather unfortunate situations.

The students began by discussing their methods courses on campus in relation to their student teaching situations. Since the students conducted the panel themselves with no guidelines other than the purpose of discussing their student teaching expectations (myths), experiences, and new knowledge and confidence, they were quite frank and responsive to the leader, the graduate student. They used such phrases as, "Those methods aren't all that they're cracked up to be!" The expression, "on-the-job training" was used to describe the student teaching experiences. They felt that these experiences were most beneficial. The supervising teacher, they felt, needed to take initiative during the first week in aiding students to adjust to the teaching situation and in meeting the student's needs. As the student teaching experience continued, the supervising teacher would expect that more questions would be asked by the student teacher.

A major question was related to the problems and issues attending the area of evaluation or grades. The panelists outlined the University policy as they understood it: the University staff member, the college supervisor, would visit the classroom and confer with the supervising teacher and the student teacher after observing in the classroom every other week. The supervising teacher is responsible for planned conferences with the student teacher including planning and evaluating lessons. The supervising teacher and the college supervisor evaluate and determine jointly the grade for the student teaching experience. The panelists continued by indicating that the mid-term grade and evaluation were important and necessary. Here the importance of the supervising teacher-student teacher conference was stressed as one of the most important learning situations in the experience. A few of the students who had had unfortunate experiences complained that they did not have conferences and that they were never sure of what they needed to do to improve their performance. As they pooled their experiences, the panelists felt that daily conferences were most desirable and beneficial.

One of the students who has not yet done student teaching asked what the supervising teachers did while the students were teaching. The students who had already completed their student teaching related a variety of experiences. One had the supervising teacher come in and "wish me luck" and disappear until day's end. Others stated that their supervising teachers faded in and out of the room, but not out of "ear-shot." The consensus of opinion was that the latter situation was the most desirable. One problem area seemed to be that of the policy regarding the situation of a supervising teacher's absence. Some panelists reported that they had been expected to "take charge" alone although they thought this was contrary to the University's policy. One of the panelists clarified this through his own experience in which the principal knew the policy and provided a substitute teacher. The panelists all agreed that the University should clarify this situation for the cooperating schools.

The role of the student teacher in the classroom as seen by the children, school staff and faculty, and the supervising teacher was in need of interpretation. The panelists who were looking forward to student teaching were concerned about how their presence would be explained to the children. Other panelists gave their varied experiences, such as: "I walked in and as I was being introduced, a child said, 'Ugh.'" Another student stated, "I was introduced as a new teacher who would be working with Mrs. _______ for a few weeks." "Well, my supervising teacher had already laid the ground work by explaining what student teaching meant and that I would have the same responsibilities and authority as any other teacher. So, I guess I had it pretty good!" The consensus here was that the supervising teachers knew their classes and had the responsibility for interpreting this role to the children.

Again, those in the myth stage were concerned about whether or not they would be able to be themselves or if they had to be "carbon copies" of their supervising teachers. The varying experiences of the panelists were again apparent. Some felt that they were required to be the "carbon copies"-type teachers, while those who had had good situations felt they were able to be themselves and teach accordingly. They felt that they had the responsibility for doing their best and proving that they did know themselves and could be effective teachers.

Numerous questions were raised and many experiences were related with respect to lesson plans. While most said that they really did not enjoy writing out the plans, they could definitely see the need for them. The conferences were again mentioned and stressed as a time that the lesson plans could be discussed and more meaningful learning could take place. They said lesson plans were a personal type of writing which each teacher must adapt to their own personality, needs, and teaching style. The panelists indicated that some supervising teachers made comments on the plans and this was not only appreciated but encouraged as a good learning experience.

The floor was then opened to questions from the conference participants. When asked about their academic preparation for the student teaching experience the panelists replied to several aspects of the question. Experience with children, normal and/or handicapped, was seen as very important. In fact, it was reported that many students seek out this experience beyond the experiences provided in the college curriculum. They cited experiences in day care centers, day camps, aiding in classrooms, and camp counseling as worthwhile experiences they had had. When considering the idea of discipline or discipline problems, the panelists felt that they could gain help and confidence from their supervising teachers, and the key word was calm. The panelists did feel that they needed a little more experience with instructional aids and materials; however, they felt that they knew enough and that with practical experience they could learn a great deal on their own.

In summing up their preparation for teaching they all agreed that "our background is as good as any there is!" The participants and supervising teachers felt it was extremely valuable to communicate directly with the students. The panelists were able to discuss both the strengths and weaknesses of their experiences and make valuable suggestions for future student teachers.

The student teaching panelists, through their objectivity and their positive evaluations and suggestions, have greatly aided those of us participating in the conference to learn as much or more from them, our students, as they had learned from us, their teachers.

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF THE CONFERENCE

Dr. Robert M. Anderson

A two day conference on the supervision of student teachers was conducted on May 9 and 10 at the Howard Johnson Motor Lodge, Bloomington, Illinois. The purpose of the conference was to bring together a selected group of classroom teachers who were responsible for the supervision of student teachers enrolled in the Special Education Department at Illinois State University. These supervising teachers were provided with an opportunity to interact with students and faculty representing Illinois State University.

The agenda for the conference included a variety of lectures, group discussions, panels, and other activities. Teachers in three areas of exceptionality visited the Instructional Materials Center in Springfield.

Each participant received a stipend to cover the cost of room and board, in addition to travel reimbursement.

Following the conference, an evaluation form was sent to each of the participants. There was a general feeling among the faculty, students, and supervising teachers who attended the conference, that the conference had been extremely worthwhile. The evaluation form on the next page was used to evaluate the conference. The responses to the questionnaire were compiled and are included in this section.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

I. Please list:

A. Your area of specialization (deaf, maladjusted, etc.).__________

B. Your present position (teacher, supervisor, etc.).______________

C. The number of student teachers you have supervised.______________

II. Do you feel that the conference was beneficial enough to be followed by another one next year?

Yes__________ No__________

Comments:

III. If conferences are to be held in the future, indicate the most satisfactory time for such conferences.

Fall_____ Winter_____ Spring_____ Summer_____

Comments:

IV. Indicate on the scale your evaluation of the various aspects of the conference.

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Satisfactory
General Sessions			
Discussion Groups			
Panel Discussion			
Visit to Springfield (I.M.C. & C.E.C. Conference)			

V. What suggestions would you have to improve future student teaching conferences:

The three questions on the Conference Evaluation form which are relevant to a discussion of the major problems in the administration, implementation, and evaluation of the project, are questions II, IV, and V. The responses to these questions are tabulated as follows:

II. Do you feel that the conference was beneficial enough to be followed by another one next year?

Yes 35 No 0

Comments:

"One of the best planned, informative and profitable conferences I have ever attended."

"I felt many pertinent areas were covered, such as grading, policy of the school, the background of the student academic-wise and also reactions and attitudes of the student toward student teaching."

"Thought the student panel was very good."

"To follow-up recommendations made and to finalize suggested guidelines and evaluation forms."

"The conference provided that important exchange of ideas and methods which makes for better supervision of student teachers. Many problems which have been of concern to us were thoroughly discussed and evaluated."

"You should especially try to contact teachers who will be supervising for the first time."

"I feel teachers are apprehensive about accepting a student without some introduction and advice on supervision."

"The format would need to be changed to challenge those who attended the first meeting."

"I especially enjoyed and found beneficial the panel and discussion groups. I feel it would be best to enlarge and expand on these types of activities for next year."

"It is a fine idea. Every supervising teacher should attend one."

"Most beneficial, especially the informal talk periods with other teachers of blind."

"I found the conference to be most beneficial and refreshing!"

"Having the opportunity to meet with University staff and with other supervising teachers was of real benefit. It was a help to be able to share ideas and to discuss common problems."

"Your conference was not only rewarding with regard to ideas for supervising, but was a good rapport builder between University personnel and regular teachers."

"Extremely beneficial - provides some means whereby there is a unification of ideas, methods of supervision. Very helpful to talk with others who are supervising - especially in one's own field."

"It seemed very valuable. It was informative and well handled."

"It was most helpful, especially for one who had had such limited experience in supervision."

"I feel this has been one of the best meetings I've attended in many years. I found it most rewarding and interesting. It was very well planned."

"It helps a supervisor to be able to discuss problems, situations, etc., with others in same position and then to confer with the university staff involved."

"Sitting down and talking is useful in that so many points of view are presented."

"Profitable and enjoyable."

"I feel that there should be at least two of these sessions a year. The more interaction and communication the stronger all of our programs will be!"

"For me as a 'new' supervising teacher, it was helpful. For all of us in one area, I felt that some continuity was brought about by discussion of the evaluation form about which dissatisfaction had been expressed."

IV. Indicate on the scale your evaluation of the various aspects of the conference.

	Unsatisfactory			Satisfactory		Very Satisfactory		
General Sessions				3	7	12	8	6
Discussion Groups				3	1	3	10	19
Panel Discussion		1	2	2	3	5	9	12
Visit to Springfield (I.M.C. & C.E.C.)	1		3	3	3	2	3	2
Length of Conference		1	1	4	6	4	7	11
Room and Board				2	1	3	12	15
Parking				2	4	4	10	11
Reimbursement				2	1	4	8	19

V. What suggestions would you have to improve future student teaching conferences?

"Even more opportunity for group discussion would seem feasible. The panel was excellent. Perhaps an emphasis on successful teacher techniques for assisting the student teacher might prove valuable. I have found the handbook very helpful - but with individual students (teachers, this is) - problems become very different, and I find myself wondering whether or not "this" has ever been a problem for another classroom teacher. The support given me by the college supervisors from Illinois State University has been excellent. They are most helpful and cooperative."

"I can think of no way to improve the conference in the future. I only want to say that I enjoyed the conference and feel that it was well worth my while in attending it. I do hope that more conferences are held and could include more people attending them though much could be said for the small group. Perhaps more conferences more often take care of this."

"I would suggest longer discussion groups for all areas of specialization - I was unable to meet with any group in my special area and I missed comparing notes and exchanging ideas."

"I am concerned about the unsuccessful teaching experiences some prospective teachers report during job interviews. This involves many universities not specifically Illinois State."

"If a panel is used, include students or experienced teachers in the area of speech therapy in that the viewpoints are quite different because of the nature of the program. Perhaps the General Sessions could be limited to morning only to allow more time for discussion groups. Personally, I had a most rewarding professional experience attending the workshop and I hope I was able to make a worthwhile contribution."

"Feed-back remarks (printed sheet) from student teachers in general. These remarks can be taken from the discussions at the seminars. There could be a sheet from each discipline. Both positive and negative remarks should be recorded. Supervising teachers who do not come to the conference could be asked to send in a sheet voicing problems they've encountered and would like to have discussed. Feed-back to them could be handled through the supervisor from the college."

"A separate group meeting for new supervising teachers to (1) explain student teaching program; (2) acquaint them with the courses student teacher has taken to prepare him for teaching; (3) panel of experienced supervisors to tell what they do to help student teacher."

"More student participation--perhaps inviting former students back who are in their first year of teaching."

"The panel discussion was helpful but I would also wish for emphasis on the positive; i.e., what the students feel is of most help to them. Perhaps a lab school teacher who is experienced with many types of students could give guidance in a prepared paper. The instructors from ISU gave many helpful suggestions in our discussion groups. A visit to the lab school would also be instructive. Perhaps a review of published materials on supervision that the teacher could read for edification would be beneficial. I appreciated the free time in the evening so that I might come back refreshed and ready to start again on Saturday."

"I would prefer to spend more time in open discussion on the procedures used with student teachers, expectations of the University as far as the area is concerned, and other areas of the work the students are being involved in. It would be much more valuable to have those from the zone centers meet separately--it appeared that they meet very unique problems. Meetings with more than one of the professors to discuss the course work completed before the Student Teaching experience would be valuable. The length of the conference would have been fine if the C.E.C. meeting were omitted. The trip to the Materials Center might be an option for those who have not visited there previously. Some time spent sharing new ideas, studies, etc., in the field might be of interest to all. More participation by the students might be useful to both sides. Some exposure to students with more "usual" situations might be helpful. I felt this panel was a highlight of the program. This was a refreshing experience. Congratulations! It was unique in its contribution to this supervisor's experiences with ISU."

"I would suggest keeping the conference topic to discussing methods of improving student teaching. Discussion with students is excellent.

Trip to Springfield was not pertinent and irrelative to main topic. I'd like to see more of university and hear more about material covered in courses."

"Since my undergraduate work was not done at ISU, I would have appreciated seeing your facilities. I felt it was expecting a little too much to ask us to stay until 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. Friday was a thoroughly worthwhile and enjoyable day."

"More discussion on student course-work and experiences preceeding the student teaching experience."

"More opportunity for questions to be answered - interaction among total group."

"As is usually the case in any conference I enjoyed getting acquainted with other supervising teachers and hearing about their classroom student teacher experiences. Thank you very much. I appreciate being included."

"More time for small group discussions and less time for general session."

"Student participation provided prospective and meaning and the students helped us keep in mind that the student teacher is what student teaching is all about. It would be great for them to have only a supervising teacher who had participated in this kind of conference. I found personally the conference was an ego building experience. (After the first year of teaching the classroom teacher is simply not told she is doing a great job.) - and even though the teacher does her best and knows it, it is nice to feel that other people recognize good teaching, and I felt good about being included in this conference. Discussions in the small groups which included students who had not taught yet, covered the waterfront of small and yet important areas of wonderings. It was an excellent conference - I have no other suggestions. Thank you for the opportunity."

"No suggestions for improvement; however, keep the student panel discussion. It was most revealing!"

"I think it would be helpful to include an opportunity to look at some of the new materials being used at the University, things which, perhaps, have not yet reached into the public schools. Sometimes our student teachers come to us, filled with enthusiasm about materials and equipment they use on the campus, but we have a 'communication gap,' for we have not yet seen these items. Perhaps it is not the function of such a conference to work in this area, but it would be helpful. May I add a belated word of praise for the conference? I thought the panel of students was especially good, for they really gave a different viewpoint on what the student teaching experience should, or could, be."

"Try to get more supervisors to the conference."

"Felt that the student panel was good - gave me an insight into how the student teacher feels about his experience - and also what they expect to gain from their experience. This sort of thing should be included since the same supervising teachers will not be invited to the conference year after year."

"I might have appreciated one additional speaker during the general session. Actually, I felt that the conference was very good as was!"

"The conference might be expanded to include some dialogue among disciplines. Another day of individual discipline conference time would be welcome. This conference was very meaningful. It was well planned, well managed, and well directed. In short, it was a real pleasure and most rewarding!"

"The panel discussion was very well done and a very good point of reference in the discussion groups. It would be a very good idea to have a panel of the same type in each of the discussion groups. . . much more could be gained from the smaller group situation. In the area of the physically handicapped, much use of the student teachers-to-be was made. They certainly added to the conference and should be a definite part of the future meetings."

"All supervising teachers should be included. A better representation would give us a better basis for attacking problems."

"Continue selection of participating teachers from districts of various size and general area. So many different points of view can be stimulating."

"Have comments and questions by students and supervisors submitted in advance in order to better cover more material in an agenda."

"It would be nice to have more participants for a greater exchange of ideas - thinking particularly of discussion groups."

"I would suggest some plans be made for Friday night - such as visiting the materials center at the University. A visit to classes and/or classrooms in Fairchild Hall could be very interesting, too."

"Possibly more informal scheduled discussions in an evening session and again Saturday morning would have made the conference more profitable."

"Reimbursement was more generous than necessary."

"Maybe more time should be spent in the discussion groups. It's very helpful to talk with others in one's field."

"Make use of Friday evening time."

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

WORKSHOP FOR SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION*

May 9 and 10, 1969

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Normal, Illinois

Sponsored by:

DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

and

DEPARTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL
LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

---

*This workshop was made possible by a grant through TITLE VI, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

PROGRAM

Friday, May 9

8:30 - 9:00 — Registration and Coffee
Large Conference Room

9:00 - 9:30 — Welcome, Introduction, and Orientation
Large Conference Room

Presiding: Dr. Dean Hage

Welcome and Introduction of Staff: Dr. Harold Phelps

Orientation: Dr. Robert M. Anderson
Project Director

9:30 - 10:30 — General Session
Large Conference Room

"Philosophy, Theory, and Principles of Supervision at Illinois State University." Dr. Cecilia J. Lauby

10:30 - 10:45 — Break

10:45 - 11:45 — General Session
Large Conference Room

"The Goals and Objectives of the Student Teaching Program at Illinois State University." Mr. George Richmond

12:00 - 1:30 **Luncheon** - Howard Johnson's Restaurant

1:30 - 2:30 **General Session**

"Myths or Realities!" Miss Judy Smithson

2:30 - 2:45 **Break**

2:45 - 5:00 **Discussion Groups**

Group I	Visually Handicapped	Location of group meetings to be announced
Group II	Deaf	
Group III	Speech Correction	
Group IV	Physically Handicapped	
Group V	Maladjusted	
Group VI	Mentally Retarded	
Group VII	University Administrators	

Saturday, May 10

Appropriate activities have been planned by the group leaders of each of the areas of exceptionality. Participants will be oriented to these activities by the various group leaders during the Friday afternoon group meetings.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Robert E. Abbott
Head Teacher - all areas
Waukegan Public Schools - District #61
574 McAlister Avenue
Waukegan, Illinois

Bernadette Alber
Teacher of the Visually Handicapped
Evanston High School
1600 Dodge
Evanston, Illinois

Robert M. Anderson
Associate Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Paul Baker, Student
Physically Handicapped
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Glenda K. Becker
Teacher of the Deaf
Bartonville Grade School
6000 S. Adams
Bartonville, Illinois

Kenneth R. Beckman
Assistant Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Will Berry
Teacher of the Emotionally Disturbed
Herman Adler Zone Center
2204 Griffith Drive
Champaign, Illinois

Ken Book, Student
Maladjusted
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Terry W. Bourret
Teacher of the Deaf
Webster School
1236 Maine
Quincy, Illinois

Alma C. Bruhn
Teacher of EMH
Washington School
100 Jefferson
Monticello, Illinois

Patricia A. Buhrow
Teacher of the Blind
Proviso West High School
Wolf and Harrison Streets
Hillside, Illinois

Dorothy D. Clark
Teacher of EMH
Webster School
1226 Main Street
Quincy, Illinois

Dorothy W. Clark
Assistant Professor of Speech
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Marian W. Conde
Student Teaching Supervision - all areas
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

Charlotte W. Cridland
Speech Pathologist
Roslyn Road School
Roslyn Road
Barrington, Illinois

Laurel J. Denny
Teacher of Blind
Mark Twain School
515 East Merle Lane
Wheeling, Illinois

Jean M. Dooley
Teacher of the Physically Handicapped
Thomas Jefferson School
Florence Avenue
Peoria, Illinois

Dorathy A. Eckelmann
Professor of Speech Pathology
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Lorraine A. Farr
Teacher of EMH
Isaac Swan School
700 East Oak
Canton, Illinois

Donald Farrimond
Teacher of EMH
Fairchild Hall
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Patricia J. Feller
Teacher of the Deaf
Illinois School for the Deaf
242 Webster Avenue
Jacksonville, Illinois

Dr. Geraldine K. Fergen
Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Joann C. Finlay
Teacher of Maladjusted
Madison School
6th and Madison
Hinsdale, Illinois

Eleanor L. Finley
Speech Pathologist
Ottawa Elementary Schools - Central School
400 Clinton Street
Ottawa, Illinois

Al Jean Flickinger
Faculty Assistant in Speech
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Roberta A. Fowler
Teacher, Learning Disabilities
Franklin Avenue School
4601 Franklin Avenue
Western Springs, Illinois

Dorothy E. Gemberling
Speech Pathologist
Marseilles District 155
Chicago and Illinois Streets
Marseilles, Illinois

Margaret G. Gillum
Teacher of the Deaf
Hay-Edwards School
400 West Laurence Avenue
Springfield, Illinois

Adeline E. Glenwright
Speech Pathology
Bloomington Public Schools, District #87
East Jefferson Street
Bloomington, Illinois

Mike Golden, Student
Maladjusted
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Ellen R. Haas
Speech Pathologist
Central School
Livingston Street
Pontiac, Illinois

Dean S. Hage
Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Dr. Robert E. Hemenway
Associate Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Janet A. Hightshoe
Teacher of TMH
Oakton School
2101 Oakton
Park Ridge, Illinois

Ruth M. Hoehn
Teacher of the Partially Sighted
North School
410 North Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois

Ruth V. Holmes
Teacher of the Visually Handicapped
Illinois Braille and Sight Saving School
653 East State
Jacksonville, Illinois

Merle R. Howard
Assistant Professor of Speech
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Barbara B. Hutchinson
Associate Professor of Speech Pathology
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Kay M. Kacena
Teacher of the Blind
Jack London Junior High School, District #21
1001 W. Dundee Road
Wheeling, Illinois

Ruth Koch
Teacher of the Deaf
Hay Edwards School
400 West Lawrence
Springfield, Illinois

Virgil F. Kolb
Teacher of the Physically Handicapped
Illinois Children's Hospital School
1950 West Roosevelt Road
Chicago, Illinois

Dr. Cecilia J. Lauby, Head
Department of Professional Laboratory Experiences
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Diana K. Leetch
Teacher of the Socially Maladjusted
Zeller Zone Center
5407 North University
Peoria, Illinois

Dee Leonard, Student
Maladjusted
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Era Lown
Assistant Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Anne M. Luzwick
Teacher of the Emotionally Disturbed
Adler Zone Center
2204 Griffith Drive
Champaign, Illinois

Charlene J. MacGregor
Speech Pathologist
North Palos District #117
9045 S. 88th Avenue
Oak Lawn, Illinois

Marcia Mallory, Student
Maladjusted
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Patricia McAnally
Teacher of the Deaf
Fairchild Hall
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Helen A. McCallom
Teacher of EMH
Lyons Township High School
100 S. Brainard
LaGrange, Illinois

Ruth T. Meyers
Teacher of EMH
Special Education District of Lake County
4440 West Old Grand Avenue
Gurnee, Illinois

Judy Moschel, Student
Physically Handicapped
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Joan Moticka, Student
Physically Handicapped
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

William R. Muehlhauser
Teacher of the Physically Handicapped
Downers Grove High School South
1436 Norfolk
Downers Grove, Illinois

Maude H. Nelson
Teacher, Learning Disabilities
Garden Hills School
1900 Garden Hills Drive
Champaign, Illinois

Lynn Nagel, Student
Mentally Retarded
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

M. Eugene Norris
Assistant Professor of Speech
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Harold R. Phelps, Chairman
Department of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Dan S. Rainey
Lecturer
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Sandra L. Rausch
Teacher of the Physically Handicapped and EMH
Blythe Park School
735 Leesley Road
Riverside, Illinois

Judy Reddick, Student
Deaf
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Corrine Reed, Student
Physically Handicapped
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Carol Reid, Student
Physically Handicapped
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Evelyn Rex
Assistant Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Doris Richards
Assistant Professor of Speech Pathology
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

George S. Richmond
Instructor and Supervisor of Off-Campus Student Teaching
Department of Professional Laboratory Experiences
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Carol A. Robinson
Teacher of the Deaf
Dogwood School
99 Dogwood
Park Forest, Illinois

Barbara J. Schneider
Speech Therapy
Child Study Department
Elgin Public Schools
8 South Gifford Street
Elgin, Illinois

Frances Schneider, Student
Physically Handicapped
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Judith J. Smithson
Instructor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Joann Stephens
Instructor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Vivian Tasker
Assistant Professor of Special Education
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Nancy Thomley
Instructor and Speech Therapist
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Wilma N. Tinkham
Teacher of the Blind
Westview Elementary School
705 S. Russell
Champaign, Illinois

Marilyn Jean Watson
Teacher of EMH
Child Study Department
8 South Gifford Street
Elgin, Illinois

Edith Wells
Illinois Children's Hospital School
1950 W. Roosevelt Road
Chicago, Illinois

Victor P. Wenzell, Director
Department of Special Education
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois

Brenda Wolters
Speech Pathology
Pekin Elementary Schools
Washington Street
Pekin, Illinois

Betty Woodson
Teacher of the Physically Handicapped
Fairchild Hall
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Martin A. Young
Director of Speech Audiology and Pathology
Professor of Speech
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

APPENDIX C
EVALUATION FORMS

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHER

Return to:
Professional Laboratory Experiences
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

STUDENT TEACHER______________________________ ID No ________
Last Name First Middle or Maiden

	F	D	C	B	A
THE STUDENT TEACHER AS A PERSON	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
1. Personal Traits--tack, patience, kindness, consideration, freedom from mannerisms					
2. Character--honesty, fairness, sincerity, tolerance, maturity, promptness, perseverance					
3. Appearance--neatness, grooming, appropriate dress, poise, posture					
4. Voice--clearness, decisiveness, freedom from mannerisms, appropriateness of volume, pleasantness					
5. Language Usage--oral English, written English, handwriting, spelling					
6. Mental Traits--good judgment and discrimination, openmindedness, intellectual honesty, emotional control, alertness in perceiving learners viewpoint and teaching possibilities in varied situations					
7. Cooperation--attitude toward school personnel as well as students and parents					
8. Physical Health--vigor, infrequency of illness, energy					
9. Disposition--general mental health, sense of humor, likeableness					
THE STUDENT TEACHER AS A CLASSROOM TEACHER					
1. Knowledge of Subject--knowledge of field, ability to develop ideas, accuracy, understanding of relationship with other fields					
2. Planning Learning Activities--development of objectives in terms of pupils' growth in knowledge, as well as in attitudes, understandings, appreciations					
3. Teaching Techniques--organization of subject matter and learning experiences, stimulation of pupils' learning and achievement, evaluation of students' work					

MID-TERM EVALUATION (Reverse Side)

	F Unsatisfactory	D Below Average	C Average	B Above Average	A Excellent
4. Presentation--provision for group needs, recognition of individual differences, variety of techniques, objectives based on needs of group and progress to be made, clarity and definiteness of assignments					
5. Skill in Classroom--cooperative planning, adequate records, maintenance of a learning atmosphere					
6. Classroom Management--Maintenance of effective social behavior of students, neatness and attractiveness of classroom, alertness of physical conditions of room, care of equipment					
7. Understanding of Pupils--development of good working relationship with students, fairness, objectivity					
8. Enrichment Materials--use of supplementary resources, improvement of cultural background of students					
THE STUDENT TEACHER AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION 1. Attitudes Toward Teaching--interest in teaching as a profession, initiative and enthusiasm in professional undertakings, professional reliability, and loyalty					
2. Ability to Work With Others--desire and ability to establish satisfactory human relationships with school personnel as well as with students and parents					
3. Success as a Teacher					
4. Knowledge of, and Participation in Professional Organizations					

Supervising Teacher____________________

School____________________

City____________________

Signature

____

Date

____

Sem. Hrs.	Student Teaching Area	Mid-Term Grade
________	________________	________
________	________________	________

FINAL EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING

Return to:
Professional Laboratory Experiences
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

STUDENT TEACHER -- ID. No -------
Last name First Middle or maiden

	F	D	C	B	A
	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
The Student Teacher as a Person					
1. Appearance					
2. Personality					
3. Language Usage					
The Student Teacher as a Classroom Teacher					
1. Understanding the learner					
2. Planning and Preparation					
3. Skill in the teaching-learning processes					
4. Knowledge of subject and/or content					
The Student Teacher as a Member of the Profession					
1. Attitudes toward teaching					
2. Ability to work with others					
3. Probable success as a teacher					

CONFIDENTIAL STATEMENT

Supervising Teacher--------------------
School------------------------------
City--------------------------------

Signature

Sem. Hrs.	Student Teaching Area	Grade
--------	-----------------------	-----
--------	-----------------------	-----

Date--------------------------------